



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/935,394	08/23/2001	Scott Anthony Exton	AUS920010292US1	9827
7590	03/24/2004		EXAMINER	
Duke W. Yee Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP P.O. Box 802334 Dallas, TX 75380			NGUYEN, MERILYN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2171	4
			DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/935,396	GUSLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Marilyn P Nguyen	2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 August 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Detailed action</u> .      |

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. Claims 1-35 are pending in this office action.

***Acknowledges***

2. Receipt is acknowledged of the following items:

- o Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on 01/03/2002 and made of record as Paper No. 3. The references cited on the PTOL 1449 form have been considered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 7-9 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 7-8, and 23-24, there is insufficient antecedent basis for “first entity” in the claim. No “first entity” is introduced in the base claim.

Regarding claims 9 and 25, there is insufficient antecedent basis for “privileges” in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-14, 16-30, and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Glasser (US 5,956,715).

Regarding claims 1, 17, and 33, Glasser discloses a method, an apparatus and a computer program product for administering managed resources, comprising: defining a set of privileges for a managed resource; and attaching an access control list to an object that represents the managed resource, wherein the access control list assigns at least one privilege from the set of privileges to an entity. See Col. 1, lines 54-58, col. 4, lines 36-65, and col. 7, lines 5-12.

Regarding claims 6, 22, and 34, Glasser discloses a method for administering a plurality of managed resources including at least one first level resource and at least one second level resource, wherein each of the at least one second level resource is a subresource of a first level resource (See Fig. 4, and col. 6, line 55 to col. 7, line 11) comprising:

- defining a first set of permissions for the at least one first level resource (See Col. 7, lines 7-10); and
- attaching a first access control list to a first object that represents a first managed resource, wherein the first managed resource is a first level resource and the first

access control list controls access to the first managed resource and at least one subresource of the first managed resource based on the first set of permissions (See col. 7, lines 5-27).

Regarding claims 11, 27, and 35, Glasser discloses a method for administering managed resources, comprising:

- receiving a request from a user to perform an operation on a managed resource (See col. 9, line 58 to col. 10, line 3);
- finding an access control list corresponding to the managed resource (See col. 10, lines 4-14); and
- determining whether the operation is permitted for the user based on the access control list (See col. 10, lines 15-29).

See also col. 10, lines 48-67.

Regarding claims 2-3, 7-8, 18-19, and 23-24, Glasser discloses the entity is an individual user/a group of users (See Col. 7, lines 5-12).

Regarding claims 4 and 20, Glasser discloses the managed resource is one of a plurality of managed resources arranged in a hierarchy (See Fig. 4, for example, and Col. 3, lines 1- 10).

Regarding claims 5, 9, 21, and 25, Glasser discloses the set of privileges comprises a set of operations that may be performed for the managed resource (See col. 4, lines 43-49).

Regarding claims 10 and 26, Glasser discloses defining a second set of permissions for a second managed resource; and attaching a second access control list to a second object that represents the second managed resource, wherein the second access control list controls access to the second managed resource and at least one subresource of the second managed resource based on the second set of permissions (See col. 7, lines 5-40).

Regarding claims 12 and 28, Glasser discloses the managed resource is one of a plurality of managed resources arranged in a hierarchy and wherein the step of finding an access control list comprises searching the hierarchy for an access control list which is attached closest to the managed resource (See col. 10, lines 4-29).

Regarding claims 13 and 29, Glasser discloses the step of finding an access control list comprises finding a first access control list that assigns a first permission for the user and a second access control list that assigns a second permission for the user (See col. 10, lines 15-29).

Regarding claims 14 and 30, Glasser discloses the step of determining whether the operation is permitted for the use comprises selecting the access control list, from the first access control list and the second access control list, with a permission that more specifically matches the user (See col. 10, lines 15-29).

Regarding claims 16 and 32, Glasser discloses the method is performed by an authorization server (server 120, Fig. 1).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 15 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glasser (US 5,956,715), in view of Abadi (US 5,315,657).

Regarding claims 15 and 31, Glasser discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above. Glasser teaches the first permission identifies a first set of operations permitted for the user and the second permission identifies a second set of operations permitted for the user (See col. 8, lines 17-26, Glass et al.). However, Glasser is silent as to determining whether the operation is permitted for the user comprises performing an OR operation on the first set of operations and the second set of operations. On the other hand, Abadi teaches performing an OR (UNION) operation on two sets of operations (See Fig. 10, and col. 18, lines 22-58, Abadi et al.). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Abadi's access right expressions (such as OR operation) onto the first set and the second set of operations of Glasser so that permissions is correctly determined for the

specific user. The motivation would have been to enable the system to perform accurate computing of the user's permissions when the user belongs to more than one group of resources.

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lewis U.S Patent No. 6,233,576 discloses enhanced security for computer system resources with a resource access authorization control facility that creates files and provides increased granularity of resource permission.

Win U.S Patent No. 6,453,353 discloses role-based navigation of information resources.

Fabbio U.S Patent No. 5,335,346 discloses access control policies for an object oriented database, including access control lists which span across object boundaries.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Merilyn P Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5177. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Mn

MN

March 12, 2004



SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100